

Remarks

Claims 1-3, 5-12, 14-17 and 23-25 are pending in the current application. The claims have not been amended.

The drawings have been amended as requested by the Examiner.

Claims 1-3, 5-12, 14-17 and 23-25 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Trompower et al., U.S. Pat. No. 6,088,591. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections because the cited references do not disclose or suggest every element of any claim, as the following analysis shows.

CLAIM 1

Claim 1 recites, in part, “wherein polling the first master transmitting device includes determining whether the first master transmitting device is receiving a signal from a slave transmitting device.”

The Office Action dated 1/12/05 recognized that Trompower does not disclose polling and determining that the first master is receiving a signal from a slave transmitting device.

The Office Action dated 8/10/05 asserts that Trompower discloses this claim element with reference to Col. 21, lines 31-32 of Trompower, indicating that “the polling which the wireless base station performs includes using information such as signal quality and traffic load which in effect tells the polling master device whether the other master device is receiving a signal from a slave device.” Applicant respectfully disagrees. Column 21, lines 7-36 of Trompower discloses a base station performing an “exhaustive scan” in order to determine all possible base stations to which it may register:

“An exhaustive scan, which is known to those having ordinary skill in the art, is one in which scanning for a possible base station continues even after a possible base station is found in order to determine if there are other possible base stations 154, 156 with which may provide for better system performance. Thus, exhaustive scans typically provide that the wireless base station 156 actively or passively scans all channels for a predetermined period of time wherein the predetermined period of time is long enough to give a very high probability of finding all possible base stations available. Following the exhaustive scan, the wireless base station 156 selects the base station 154, 156 which provides the best system performance based on conventional criteria such as signal quality, traffic load, and the number of system hops needed to reach the system backbone 152.” Column 21, lines 7-36 of Trompower

An exhaustive scan is not the same as “polling a first master transmitting device with a second master transmitting device to determine a hopping sequence of the first master transmitting device” as recited in Claim 1.

Further, the signal quality is indicative of the signal strength between the wireless base station 156 and another base station – not between the other base station and a slave device. Thus, Trompower does not disclose or suggest “wherein polling the first master transmitting device includes determining whether the first master transmitting device is receiving a signal from a slave transmitting device” as recited in Claim 1.

The rejection of Claim 1 is thus unsupported, and must be withdrawn. Claims 2-3, 5-12 depend from allowable Claim 1 and are allowable for at least this reason.

CLAIM 14

Claim 14 recites, in part, “polling the first master from the second master to determine if the first master is receiving a signal from the slave device.”

The Office Action dated 1/12/05 recognized that Trompower does not disclose polling and determining that the first master is receiving a signal from a slave transmitting device.

Further, as illustrated above with respect to Claim 1, Trompower does not disclose “polling the first master from the second master to determine if the first master is receiving a signal from the slave device” as recited in Claim 14.

The rejection of Claim 14 is thus unsupported, and must be withdrawn. Claims 15-17 depend from allowable Claim 14 and are allowable for at least this reason.

CLAIM 23

Claim 23 recites, in part “polling the first master from the second master to determine if the first master is receiving a signal from the slave.”

The Office Action dated 1/12/05 recognized that Trompower does not disclose polling and determining that the first master is receiving a signal from a slave transmitting device.

Further, as illustrated above with respect to Claim 1, Trompower does not disclose “polling the first master from the second master to determine if the first master is receiving a signal from the slave” as recited in Claim 23.

The rejection of Claim 23 is thus unsupported, and must be withdrawn. Claims 24-25 depend from allowable Claim 23 and are allowable for at least this reason.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance, and indication of allowance by the Examiner is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions concerning this application, he or she is requested to telephone the undersigned at the telephone number shown below as soon as possible. If any fee insufficiency or overpayment is found, please charge any insufficiency or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

Intel Corporation

Date: __November 8, 2005__ ____/Rita M. Wisor/_Reg. No. 41,382____

Rita M. Wisor
Reg. No. 41,382

Attorney Phone Number: (512) 732-3923

Correspondence Address: Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman, LLP
12400 Wilshire Blvd
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026

Amendments to the Drawings

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Fig. 2. This sheet replaces the original sheet 2.

Original sheet 2, Fig. 2, previously omitted verbal labels which have been added. The label “COMMUNICATION DEVICE” has been added to element 200. The label “PROCESSOR” has been added to element 210. The label “MEMORY” has been added to element 220. The label “TRANSCIEVER” has been added to element 230. Subject matter support for this amendment can be found in the Specification, paragraphs [0021] and [0022].

Attachment: Replacement sheet.